Leisure Studies
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rlst20

Theorisations of leisure in inter-war Britain

Robert Snape [a] & Helen Pussard [b]
[a] Centre for Worktown Studies, University of Bolton, Bolton, UK
[b] Independent Researcher, London, UK
Version of record first published: 09 Nov 2011.

To cite this article: Robert Snape & Helen Pussard (2011): Theorisations of leisure in inter-war Britain, Leisure Studies, DOI:10.1080/02614367.2011.629371

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2011.629371

Leisure Studies
iFirst article, 2011, 1–18

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Theorisations of leisure in inter-war Britain

Robert Snape[a]* and Helen Pussard[b]

[a]*Centre for Worktown Studies, University of Bolton, Bolton, UK;* [b]*Independent Researcher, London, UK*

(*Received 15 June 2011; final version received 2 October 2011*)

The National Conference on the Leisure of the People in 1919 marked the emergence of a public discourse on the nature and purpose of leisure in inter-war Britain. One strand of this discourse saw leisure to be problematic as new forms of mass and passive entertainment, the 'enforced leisure' of unemployment and the right use of leisure became areas of social concern. Perceptive critics, however, conceptualised leisure as a social sphere in which a new and better post-war society could be built through a democratic 'new' leisure and the use of leisure as a vehicle for education in citizenship. Leisure was widely documented in contemporary social surveys and became valued by local councils of social service in developing social life and community identity on new housing estates. This paper argues that a new ontology of leisure was forged between the wars as the Victorian emphasis on rational recreation and private morality was superseded by an understanding of leisure as a social product of late modernity.

Keywords: leisure; history; theory; citizenship; modernity

Introduction

Leisure Studies was formalised as an academic subject field in Great Britain through the establishment in 1975 of the Leisure Studies Association and the publication in 1982 of the first volume of *Leisure Studies*. Several important works on leisure had become available in Britain between the end of the Second World War and the mid-1970s, notable examples being Rowntree and Lavers (1951) *English Life and Leisure*, de Grazia (1962) *Of Time, Work and Leisure*, Dumazedier (1967) *Towards a Society of Leisure*, Kaplan (1960) *Leisure in America* and Roberts (1970) *Leisure*. The growth of cultural studies further raised interest in the production and consumption of leisure through publications such as Hoggart's (1958) *The Uses of Literacy* and Hall and Whannel's (1964) *The Popular Arts*. These events, however, marked not a beginning but a transitional phase in the study and theorisation of leisure in Britain. There was in fact a substantial public discourse of leisure in the inter-war decades, conducted through numerous monographs, social surveys, official reports and newspaper comment on the nature and purpose of leisure in post-First World War society. Much of this work anticipated the inter-disciplinary profile of Leisure Studies in Britain, described in the first issue of *Leisure Studies* as embracing sociology, economics, psychology and the everyday (Haworth, Parker,

*Corresponding author. Email: r.snape@bolton.ac.uk

ISSN 0261-4367 print/ISSN 1466-4496 online

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2011.629371
http://www.tandfonline.com

& Roberts, 1982). However, this discourse has received minimal attention within Leisure Studies and remains relatively unknown.

Both Mommaas (1996, 1997) and Tinkler (2003) have made important contributions to the historiography of leisure as an aspect of twentieth century modernity but approach this from differing perspectives and do not focus in detail on the socio-cultural changes which underpinned the theorisation of leisure in Britain in this period. Perceptive contemporary observers recognised the emergence of a 'new' leisure. Burns[1] (1932, p. 1), for example, identified leisure as the 'most valuable product of modern mechanisms and modern social organisation' while Durant (1938, p. 18) saw a Gospel of Leisure to have replaced the Gospel of Work. The aims of this article are to outline the principal themes in the theorisation of leisure in Britain between the two world wars and to relate these to contemporary economic, social and cultural change. Space precludes an international scope, though a significant body of work on leisure was produced in America to which this paper refers where appropriate. Leisure was both feared and welcomed between the wars and this paper reviews competing views of leisure as either a dysfunctional force or a social sphere through which to promote social and spiritual regeneration and the growth of a civic and civilised post-war society.

Social and cultural contexts of leisure post-First World War

The evolution of an inter-war discourse of leisure in Britain drew from the post World War One debate on social reconstruction and the changed socio-cultural significance of leisure. After the war, improved material conditions and increased consumption contributed to the growth and spread of leisure, particularly amongst the working classes. Women became more independent and enjoyed a wider range of leisure opportunities than previously (Pruette, 1924; Tinkler, 2003) and established spectator sports such as football and rugby were joined by new sports, notably speedway in 1927 and greyhound racing in 1926, the latter making legal betting more widely available. The introduction of the football pools, which by 1936 had between five and seven million weekly participants, further legitimated betting, though to its critics betting remained an 'invidious evil' (Rowntree, 1930). The period also saw the growth of mass leisure, heralded by the 'new behemoth' of advertising, newspapers, the wireless and the cinema (Mowat, 1955, pp. 240–241). In contrast to mass and passive leisure forms, the outdoor leisure movement, nurtured in the pre-war period through organisations such as the Co-operative Holidays Association and the Holiday Fellowship, continued to flourish and became the locus of a youth leisure movement grounded in rambling, cycling and camping groups. While some forms of leisure, for example the cinema and spectator sport, brought the social classes closer together, industrial change and mass unemployment led to marked regional differences in prosperity between the old and mainly northern industrial areas and those in the midlands and south where light engineering and electrical industries brought new employment and higher wages. These contrasts were mediated through leisure. The change from the Edwardian period was profound and was recognised by contemporary critics: leisure had come with a 'startling suddenness' as both 'an asset and a problem' (Neumeyer & Neumeyer, 1936, p. 12) and it was a 'new kind of leisure' entirely different to the old leisure of the leisured classes (Burns, 1932, p. 161). The significance of the new leisure

was, as Durant (1938, p. 4) pointed out, that it represented 'one of the crucial points at which many of the strains in our society converge'.

The First World War exercised a profound impact on British society, producing a post-war world with a greatly diminished belief in Edwardian values and the coming of the 'new leisure' occurred in a context of social upheaval and a pervading spirit of change (Montgomery, 1957, pp. 41–42; Mowat, 1955, p. 201). Reconstruction was not solely a political or an economic problem but one which required a revival of moral and intellectual energy (*Sociological Review*, 1918) and contemporary social and political thinking was directed towards the creation of a new and better society (Hopkins, 2000, pp. 220–221; Mowat, 1955, p. 480). The inter-war period was also marked by an underlying concern about the collapse of civilisation and a corresponding reaction to this, described by Overy (2010, p. 367) as the emergence of a diagnostic culture which sought to produce solutions and cures. Leisure was part of this remedial culture and was seen as important to social renewal and a new civilised way of life (Burns, 1931, pp. 227–228). However, leisure was also considered problematic as passivity, escapism and the 'enforced leisure' of unemployment were counter-productive to a reconstruction of civic society. Furthermore, changed moral standards forced re-assessments of social values and leisure practices (Morgan, 2001, p. 601).

The coming of leisure

Leisure was a conspicuous element of social and political discourse throughout the inter-war years, reflected in an increased preference in public debate for the word 'leisure' rather than 'recreation'. The shift of focus to 'leisure' was immediately in evidence in the National Conference on the Leisure of the People, held in Manchester in 1919. Co-ordinated by the National Council of Social Service (NCSS), this revealed a widespread active interest in leisure within social work and through its topics of discussion, which included work–leisure relationships, passive and active leisure, social work, citizenship and the leisure of young people, framed the context within which leisure would be debated over the following two decades. The backgrounds of the conference speakers formed a link between late-Victorian and Edwardian social service approaches to recreation and new post-war approaches to leisure and represented a microcosm of the movements and agencies which shaped theorisations and interventions in leisure in the post-war world. Examples include John Lewis Paton, son of the Victorian social reformer John Brown Paton and an active helper in the Ancoats university settlement; Henry Carter, secretary of the temperance and social welfare committee of the Wesleyan Methodist church; Walter Carroll, who in 1918 resigned his post of professor at the Royal Manchester College of Music to devote himself to working with under-privileged schoolchildren; Charles George Ammon, trade unionist, founder member of the Independent Labour Party, Wesleyan lay preacher and temperance advocate; Arthur Clutton-Brock, art critic of the *Times*, Fabian and active member of the Labour Party and Emily Kinnaird, honorary Secretary of the Young Women's Christian Association. The importance of the conference was, as Brasnett (1969, p. 27) has observed, that it established a concept of social service not limited to relief work for casualties but embracing all aspects of community life. Leisure, which was distributed across social, cultural and educational public spheres, fitted naturally into this new interpretation. The association of leisure with social service, defined as being concerned

with social rather than individual reform (Attlee, 1920), marked a transition from the Victorian and Edwardian emphasis on the moral improvement of the individual to that of social change and the development of citizenship and was an important factor in the conceptualisation of leisure as a social as well as an individual entity.

The changed ontological status of leisure as an integral element of the social sphere was partly effected through its inclusion in inter-war social surveys. Following the pattern set by Booth and Rowntree, these tended not to cover the whole of society but were concerned with working class poverty and socio-economic inequality (Wells, 1936). Their focus on the unemployed and those living in crowded conditions associated their documentation of leisure with social and community reform. After the National Conference of 1919 the NCSS commissioned 50 councils of social service to report on leisure in their locality. One such, the Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid (1923) *Report on the Uses of Leisure in Liverpool* outlined the principal types of leisure provision in the city and demonstrated how social service was replacing philanthropy in supporting the leisure needs of ordinary citizens. The report on the use of leisure in Bethnal Green (Harris, 1927) portrayed a less positive scenario, recording that although Churches and clubs provided a wide range of leisure opportunities, the adult population displayed little appetite for 'real' culture or education and remained victimised by the creation of artificial desires in leisure. By 1919, 10 universities in the UK provided training in social work (National Conference on the Leisure of the People, 1919) stimulating universities to take an interest in leisure and to investigate it through large scale social surveys. Notable examples include Jones' (1934) *Social Survey of Merseyside* and the nine volume *New Survey of London Life and Labour*, the latter claiming to break new ground on the basis that there was no established method for investigating the ways in which leisure was used (Smith, 1935a, pp. 2–37).

While most surveys adopted a quantitative approach, the London survey collected qualitative data by commissioning working class people to write essays which demonstrated the importance of leisure to their everyday lives and gave insights to the leisure of a 'usually inarticulate class' which could be obtained through no other route' (Smith, 1935a, p. 37). Ethnographic methodology became increasingly evident in the social documentation of leisure, influenced by the Lynd and Lynd's (1929) Middletown survey in the USA. As Clark Wissler noted in his introduction to this study, it represented not only a methodological experiment but a new field of the social anthropology of contemporary life. The chapters on leisure occupied almost one-fifth of the book and served as an inspiration for Mass Observation's Worktown project which collected data on everyday leisure and published a study of working class drinking patterns in Bolton in 1943 (Hubble, 2010, pp. 34–35; Mass Observation, 1987). Rowntree's (1941) survey of York – which pointedly declared that no account of the working classes could be complete without reference to their leisure – also used diary keeping to record the ways in which leisure time was used. The normative inclusion of leisure in social surveys reflected its importance to social service and underpinned its validity as a field of social investigation, affirming the observation of the New London Survey that the main centre of interest of a worker's life was shifting from his daily work to his daily leisure (Smith, 1935a, p. 1).

The perception of leisure as a problem in inter-war Britain

The title of Durant's (1938) book *The Problem of Leisure*, based upon doctoral research at the London School of Economics, encapsulated a widespread view of leisure as a social problem, portrayed in titles such as *The Threat of Leisure* (Cutten, 1926), *The Challenge of Leisure* (Pack, 1934), *The Challenge of Leisure* (Boyd & Ogilvie, 1936) and *The Fear of Leisure* (Orage, 1935). The theorisation of leisure as a socially dysfunctional entity drew from three inter-related areas, namely the relationship between work and leisure in terms of time available for leisure and the influence of work upon leisure practice, the consumption of leisure, and the impact of new technologically enabled forms of mass leisure. Like other social problems of the inter-war period, those pertaining to leisure were seen as products of social organisation rather than individual behaviour and thus requiring social solutions (Perkin, 1989, p. 356).

Work–leisure relationships

Leisure featured in industrial wage negotiations from Lloyd George's assertion in 1919 that hours of work would be reduced to allow more leisure for the worker (*Times*, 1919a) to the International Labour Office's (ILO) campaign for shorter hours and holidays with pay in 1939 (ILO, 1924, 1939). Although the availability of overtime meant that many manual workers did not work fewer hours (Jones, 1986, pp. 14–22), time remained a prominent element in wage bargaining. Britain remained an industrialised economy between the wars. Manual workers represented over 70% of the working population in both 1921 and 1931 with mining, engineering, textiles and vehicles production accounting for almost one-fifth of all workers (Thorpe, 1994, p. 87). For the greater proportion of the working population therefore, work tended to be mechanised and monotonous and was considered to lead workers to devote their leisure to passive pursuits and escapism (Castle, Ottaway, & Rawson, 1935, pp. 16–17; Dark, 1929, p. 6; Joad, 1929, p. 65). In Liverpool for example, Jones (1934, p. 268) found many workers regarded their job solely as a means of providing resources to be spent in leisure, their only opportunity for free activity and expression. As had been argued at the National Conference on the Leisure of the People (1919, p. 16), this tendency was not due to a lack of opportunities but a reflection of people's inability to take advantage of the 'new conditions' for leisure.

Theorisations of the work–leisure relationship reflected William Morris' view that fulfilling work was crucial to personal well-being and a proper use of leisure (Kinna, 2000). Addressing the 1919 Conference on the topic of 'Work and Leisure' Arthur Clutton Brock posited a connection between the work which people did and the ways in which they used their leisure (National Conference on the Leisure of the People, 1919, p. 7) and the idea of a determining relationship between work and leisure remained influential throughout the period (Dark, 1929; Harris, 1927, p. 62; Jacks, 1931, p. 102). Jacks, in his preface to the report on leisure in Bethnal Green (Harris, 1927) observed a close correspondence between the two, noting that if work were monotonous, leisure would tend to be 'stupid, boring and perhaps vicious' and occupations such as cotton-spinning, dyeing, scavenging and even accountancy were suggested as typifying jobs which did not provide opportunities for moral development and obliged employees to seek fulfilment outside work

(Burns, 1925, p. 112). It was however argued that this effect might not apply to those employed in fulfilling artistic or creative occupations in which the relationship between work and leisure would be complementary (Durant, 1938, pp. 249–250). The solution to the work–leisure dichotomy was thus not to be found within leisure but in the re-structuring of work such that employees would perceive themselves to be useful and would not be impelled to use their leisure in a restless search for justification of their existence (Durant, 1938, pp. 258–259; National Conference on the Leisure of the People, 1919).

Unemployment

The formulation of a work–leisure relationship negated definitions of leisure as the absence of work, even though the phrase 'enforced leisure' became a euphemism for the time available to the unemployed. As Durant (1938, p. 105) suggested, leisure was pleasant only if a man was assured of the reason for its existence and the notion of the 'excessive leisure of the unemployed' thus became problematic (Jones, 1934, p. 265). Unemployment remained above one million from 1923 to 1930 and above two million from 1931 to 1936 (Thorpe, 1994, p. 88). If unemployment represented economic ill health, 'enforced leisure' equated to spiritual sickness and the encouragement of a positive use of leisure by the unemployed became a prominent aspect of social service through organisations such as the Workers Educational Association, the Pilgrim Trust, the Educational Settlements Movement and, from 1932, the Voluntary Occupational Centre Movement (Henriques, 1938, pp. 115–120). In Liverpool, where 140,000 were unemployed in 1933, special measures included physical training classes provided through the Ministry of Labour, the Council provision of allotments, free access to football pitches and public baths and the establishment of 30 occupational centres by the Liverpool Council of Social Service; these interventions, however affected no more than a tiny proportion of the adult unemployed (Jones, 1934). Providing leisure opportunities for the unemployed was fraught with difficulties and the fact remained, as Ellen Wilkinson (1939, pp. 231–234), Labour Member of Parliament for Middlesbrough East remarked, that unemployed men had a hatred of being organised by young graduates connected with social service and of all other forms of leisure provision associated with charity. Instead, as Orwell (1962, pp. 75–77) saw in Wigan, the unemployed preferred the 'fantastically cheap' pictures, the free public library and organised gambling. Jacks (1931, p. 106) too acknowledged the ability of commercial providers to offer attractive and affordable leisure opportunities to the unemployed, citing the greater appeal of greyhound racing in Lancashire than WEA classes. Nevertheless, the political and social urgency with which approved leisure opportunities were provided for the unemployed anticipated a similar reaction in the 1980s as leisure interventions sought to alleviate the mental stresses of unemployment while also restraining social unrest.

Mass leisure

In *The Growth of Common Enjoyment*, Hammond (1933) sought to historicise the increased free time of the working classes, stating that although Britain became one of the richest nations in the nineteenth century, it remained poor in terms of social amenities for recreation and enjoyment. He argued that as Britain had remained

outside of the Graeco-Roman tradition of 'common enjoyment', leisure had been rendered a privilege of class. Legislative changes had effected a fundamental revolution by giving more time and amenities to the working classes, starting in the mid-nineteenth century and gathering 'a dazzling pace' since 1918. However, without the leisure traditions of other countries, Hammond was concerned whether the 'mass' of men and women could use or enjoy so much leisure. This characterisation of Britain as historically unprepared for the emergence of mass leisure resonated with several critics who, like Hammond (1933, p. 18), found in mass leisure the paradox of 'unprecedented opportunities' for either educating or corrupting.

The new mass leisure forms of the cinema and the wireless, like the work mode of mass production, raised concerns about standardisation, the erosion of human agency and a lack of capacity to offer fulfilment. In 1927, 21.1% of the population had access to a wireless set, rising to 68.5% by 1937 (McKibbin, 2000, p. 457; Thorpe, 1994). The cinema too was a virtually ubiquitous form of popular entertainment and from the 1920s the chain cinema organisations built larger venues accommodating around 1000 people (Hill, 2002, pp. 60–61); by 1934 annual cinema attendances had risen to 903 million (Thorpe, 1994). Both the wireless and the cinema enabled large audiences to participate in the same passive leisure experience at effectively the same time.

The association of the technological base of new mass leisure forms with mass industrial production re-invoked the metaphor of the 'mechanical age' (Arnold, 1960; Carlyle, 1870) as the trope of machinery was deployed to suggest structural relationships between industrial production and mass leisure. As early as 1917, Sizer (1917, p. 71) argued that mechanisation had induced monotony and increased commercialisation in America while in Britain Durant (1938, p. 17) discerned a 'machinery of amusement' to have filled the cultural void created by industrialism; leisure had lost its capacity to offer a cathartic experience and was turning people into spectators of the society in which they lived. Several critics described the social impact of mass leisure through the metaphor of machinery. The *New London Survey* (Smith, 1935a, p. 8) for example identified cinema and radio as outstanding examples of the 'mechanising of entertainment' while both Lundberg, Komarovsky, and McInerny (1934) and Durant (1938, pp. 21–22) believed that the 'machinery of amusement' led to unfulfilling leisure. Burns (1925, p. 98) too observed industrial workers in 'close contact with machines' to be themselves in danger of becoming 'mechanized'.

The machinery of amusement led at best to a passive receptivity (Lundberg et al., 1934, p. 15) and at worst to a 'dictatorship of amusement and even of opinion' (Smith, 1935a). Mass consumption became synonymous with passive leisure; Burns (1932, p. 136), for example, saw the 'new world of mechanisms' to embody mental attitudes in which technological leisure forms such as cinemas and motor cars were examples of modern desires in crude material form. Dorothy Sayers (1933), an unlikely though perceptive critic of leisure, argued that passive consumption had made leisure 'meaningless' by leading the poor to desire whatever might give them a fleeting illusion of a luxury beyond their reach, a point not dissimilar to Orwell's (1937/1962) observation on the compensatory effects of cheap luxuries.

The impact of the new mass leisure forms on cultural values and norms was a related concern. Aggressive critiques were launched from the cultural right which saw in popular literature and the cinema an erosion of values and an Americanisation of English language and culture (Cunningham, 1988, pp. 276–282; Joad, 1929,

p. 13; Montgomery, 1957, p. 59). In the vanguard of this attack were the Leavises who insisted that the problem of contemporary leisure lay with 'the machine', with broadcasting and cinema being passive diversions which made active recreation and the use of the mind more difficult (Leavis, 1930, p. 7). Mass entertainment implied a levelling down of taste, with the temptation to embrace the cinema, radio, large circulation newspapers and magazines, the dance hall and the loud speaker being beyond most peoples' ability to resist (Leavis, 1932). The Leavises too railed against the influence of American cinema on English culture, echoing Lynd and Lynd's (1929) survey which recorded the vicarious nature of the cinema and the commercial appeal of sentimental films (Leavis, 1930, p. 6). Similarly the philosopher Joad (1929, p. 65) argued that the intensive commercialisation of leisure had led to a loss of understanding of the 'proper' use of leisure. Mechanisation was seen to have increased leisure in quantitative terms only (Lundberg et al., 1934) and Orwell (1962, p. 44), again, encapsulated the restriction of the choice offered by mass leisure in commenting on the passivity of the working man who 'did not act but was acted upon'. However, some critics saw mass leisure forms as socially beneficial on the grounds that doing the same thing at the same time – for example watching a film at the cinema – was democratising and furthered equality by widening choice in leisure (Burns, 1931, pp. 219–270; 1932, pp. 148–172).

The new leisure

Post-war renewal required not only economic recovery but social and spiritual regeneration (Hopkins 2000, pp. 220–221; Pack, 1934, p. 23) and in contrast to perceptions of leisure as a problem there developed an alternative concept of leisure as a public sphere in which social and civic renewal could be shaped and nurtured. This was to be effected through a new leisure, informed by social democracy and education and infused with a capacity to enhance community life. The function of the new leisure in the new society was forcibly argued in Burns' (1932) *Leisure in the Modern World*. Like the Lynds (1929), Burns presented leisure as an aspect of twentieth century modernity, historically changed from its nineteenth century forms. In the modern world, leisure was not only a means of rest but, in the sense of *schole*, had intrinsic value, a cultural space in which a new democratic society could grow through a lived culture of everyday life (Burns, 1929, p. 52; 1932, pp. 151–152). This would necessitate a more equitable distribution of leisure in which a dependence on the values of a leisure class would be rejected for a new leisure:

> . . . the principle on which our use of leisure should rest should *not* involve attempting to turn everybody into a lady or a gentleman on the old model. We should invent a new model – that is to say, we should be concerned *not* with living up to the old ideal but with establishing in practice a new ideal. That is what is meant by the phrase that 'new leisure makes new men': the new kind of leisure can make men and women just as good as the ladies and gentlemen of an earlier age, if we know what we want and have enough skill to get it. (Burns, 1932, p. 163)

As an example of what was possible Burns pointed to young people who, living in late modernity, felt less bound than had their parents to adhere to traditional standards. Gardiner (1936) too saw the potential of young people to forge a new leisure; addressing the World Congress on Leisure in Berlin in 1936 he suggested

this might be facilitated through a reinvigoration of folk culture and saw evidence of this in the youth movement and the revival of folk dance. In essence, the new leisure was to emerge organically from the people and not to be an emulation of that of a leisure class:

> leisure and [their] culture can evolve spontaneously, just as the folk-songs and country dances arose from the people in earlier times. The things counted valuable, the standards of behaviour, the mode of dress, will not, as now, be copied from the few who occupy the leading social positions, but will be created by the people taking charge of their own lives. (Durant, 1938, pp. 261–262)

The democratic idealism which underpinned the new leisure incorporated the promotion of equality and greater independence for women. A woman's leisure was, as the *Times* (1921) observed, different to that before 1914 and the leisure of young women in particular was a source of concern in terms of social and moral safety (Tinkler, 2003). Leisure was a site of emancipation for young women in the years immediately after the war as fashion, dancing, the use of make-up and smoking radically challenged Edwardian concepts of femininity (Green, 1976, pp. 206–208). Nevertheless, by the 1930s women's freedom in leisure was seen to lag behind advancements in political and educational status and it was argued that rather than being determined by social gender roles, women's leisure should enable a 'companionship of equals' between men and women (Burns, 1932, p. 114). Women's Institutes, of which there were 5000 in 1933 with 297,000 members (Mowat, 1955, p. 256) introduced new interests and new ways of using leisure while the cinema, radio and betting were cited as examples of leisure in which women could act independently, with or without the company of men (Burns, 1932, p. 109). The younger generation of women in particular found greater equality in new democratic forms of leisure such as the outdoor movement (Burns, 1932, pp. 136–147). New opportunities to develop physical fitness also allowed women to pursue equality and independence, though the cultivation of a modern female body remained controversial (Zweiniger-Bargielowska, 2011). There were however concerns about the leisure of young working class women, especially in areas of high unemployment where they were often obliged to seek work in other parts of the country. Many unemployed girls from the north of England entered domestic service in the south and were seen to be in particular need of education and guidance in leisure when alone in a new town. This raised new challenges which were addressed by an impressively wide range of girls' organisations which included the Girl Guides, British Camp Fire Girls, Church Girls' Brigade, Christian Alliance of Women and Girls and the National Home Fire Girls' Association (Rooff, 1935).

Social service, citizenship and leisure

The relatively sparse involvement of the state in the provision of leisure opportunities heightened the importance of voluntary action in social renewal through leisure and social service matured as a joint enterprise between the voluntary and public sectors (Harris, 2004, p. 188; Hyde, 1921, p. 239; Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1916, p. 3). Social service evolved from the universities settlement movement of the late nineteenth century in which graduates and lecturers undertook voluntary social work with poor and usually urban communities; by 1919 there were at least

28 settlements in London with a further 26 in the provinces (National Conference on the Leisure of the People, 1919). Settlements were primarily concerned with working class education but as Durant (1938, p. 238) noted, their greater importance lay in their function as neighbourhood centres and it was usual for them to co-ordinate a range of leisure opportunities and activities.

At a local level the co-ordination of social service was uneven (Mess, 1928); in some areas there was little contact between voluntary agencies but where an effective local council of service existed, several agencies could work co-operatively in the field of leisure and social reform. In Liverpool, for example, the local service council supported a wide range of leisure provision prior to the end of the First World War which included holidays, games and clubs for young people organised through agencies such as the cadet movement, the Brigade and Scout movement and the YMCA (Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1916, p. 80). This pre-war provision continued into the inter-war decades as did that at the Oxford House Settlement in Bethnal Green which organised games and sports with men's and boy's clubs into the 1920s (Harris, 1927, p. 81).

The NCSS was formed in 1919 to address the dispersed nature of social service through the systematic organisation of voluntary social work (Brasnett, 1969, pp. 22–25). Both local and national councils of social service regarded the nurturing of leisure as a core task in social renewal, particularly with young adults (Brasnett, 1969, p. 41). This included the provision of leisure opportunities through social work by, for example, promoting federations of boys' and girls' clubs, securing playing fields and open spaces, establishing social centres and citizens' institutes and helping form the Youth Hostel Association (Brasnett, 1969, p. 27; Mowat, 1955, p. 527). New housing estates, often built with minimal provision for leisure, provided a test bed in which leisure could be deployed in the development of community life and identity. In 1928, the NCSS formed a New Estates Community Committee to create 'living communities' where lack of provision for leisure restricted the growth of community life (Brasnett, 1969, pp. 62–63). By the late 1930s the efficacy of social centres in creating community integration on new estates with no history or social rallying points was widely acknowledged in calls for an increase in their number (*Times*, 1934a).

Community Centres, with their related facilitation of leisure, became, in the *Times* (1938) phrase, the power house of the new social life. The new Norris Green estate in Liverpool, for example, housed 30,000 people but had no theatres, few cinemas, few shops and no public house and the aim of the local Community Council, formed in 1930, was to provide leisure opportunities to create a sense of community interest (Jones, 1934, pp. 300–301). Similarly, the Slough Social Centre, opened in 1937 through municipal and voluntary co-operation, combined a Welfare Centre, nursery school, a branch of the Young Women's Christian Association and a wide variety of amusements and occupations, earning the accolade of being an admirable example of public policy in a changing industrial civilisation (*Times*, 1937a). Rural communities too were recognised to need new leisure opportunities to relieve the dullness of village life and encourage social interaction. In 1919, the NCSS formed a department to deal with rural districts and local social councils were subsequently established in country areas (National Conference on the Leisure of the People, 1919, p. 93). The need for focal buildings to enable leisure association and community life was met through a programme of building village halls, funded through the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust (Brasnett, 1969, p. 50).

Active leisure and citizenship

Training for citizenship was a major object of social service and consequently leisure became valued as a means to this end. Attlee (1920, p. 13), for example, described social service as a duty of citizenship while Lloyd's assertion that the best use of leisure was to make good citizens became a central tenet of social service intervention in leisure (National Conference on the Leisure of the People, 1919, p. 17). Social service was a form of 'serious leisure' (Stebbins, 1992, 2007), described by Missen (1935, pp. 48–49) as a leisure-time occupation which brought happiness 'both to those helped and those who help'. It was considered one of the most necessary tasks to post-war social reconstruction (*Times*, 1919b). Social service provided a context in which the right use of leisure could provide education in citizenship through large-scale membership leisure organisations such as the National Federation of Women's Institutes, Rotary International and the Scout and Guide Associations (McCarthy, 2007). This was particularly so with young people for whom movements such as boys' brigades, boy scouts, girl guides and Church lads' brigades were seen to be doing 'much to develop citizenship' (Badley, 1917, p. 89); a point reinforced by the *Times* (1930) which noted that a principal task of girls' clubs was to prepare girls for citizenship. Rooff (1935, p. 3), in her survey of girls' organisations in England and Wales, noted that the modern club leader was one who aimed to train her members to take responsibility and to cultivate an independence of spirit which would fit girls to take their place as citizens of the community, emphasising the importance of the 'wise use of leisure'. This could be achieved through, for example, discussion groups on current events and participation in the democratic processes of club management and governance (Rooff, 1935, p. 92).

The instrumentality of the new leisure in training for citizenship invoked the question of education in the use of leisure (Burns, 1932; Dark, 1929, pp. 26–27; Ellis, 1936, pp. 148–150) and exhortations to promote what was normatively termed the right use of leisure were a constant theme (Barker, 1933; Burns, 1932; Dark, 1929; Jacks, 1931, 1932; Jameson, 1935; Joad, 1929). The New Education Fellowship was founded in 1921 to promote social reform and adopted education in the use of leisure as a primary objective. In 1934 it commissioned a world-wide enquiry into leisure and published a report outlining the 'problem' in England which advocated that people should be prepared for the new leisure by enabling their capacity to discriminate (Boyd & Ogilvie, 1936; Castle et al., 1935). The right use of leisure was, however, as Barker (1933, p. 8) observed, a 'difficult thing' which depended upon a 'continuous process of education'. While there was a consensual view of what the right use of leisure was not – for instance gambling, drinking, sexual promiscuity and passive leisure – there were subtle variations in its interpretation. In cultural terms it was conceptualised as a reaction to mass leisure and the degeneracy of passivity, epitomised in the fear of the cinema, the public house and mass tourism (Ammon, 1919; Joad, 1929); concerns about totalitarianism were also important (Nicholas, 1998). The Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship (1924) offered an alternative interpretation which emphasised Christian morality, outdoor activities, hobby societies and social service as examples of the right use of leisure.

Some critics defined the right use of leisure in terms of the ancient Greek concept of leisure as moral training for membership of the civic community

(Barker, 1928; Burns, 1925, 1931). The implications of this idealised understanding were received with scepticism amongst writers with practical experience of engagement in working class leisure; Harris (1927, p. 54), for example, had found the adult population of Bethnal Green to be passive and apathetic in leisure. Burns (1932, pp. 149–153), however, maintained that a new leisure based on the Greek ideal would become a source of democratic and civilised life rather than merely a rest from work. The potential of the right use of leisure to improve civic life could be observed in Liverpool where ineffectively supervised independent clubs, informally established in the poorer districts, integrated whist drives and dances with perceived wrong uses of leisure which included drinking and betting; these clubs were seen to lack proper management and be in need of replacing with 'good neighbourhood clubs' (Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1923, p. 9). Subsequently the Liverpool Citizens Institute Association was established to facilitate active leisure interests and inculcate a sense of responsibility. Public libraries too sought to develop citizenship through a right use of leisure by promoting the reading of good literature as a spiritual and intellectual antidote to jazz, cinema and the public house (Robertson, 1925). In London some public library authorities, competing with perambulating libraries which lent cheap sensation fiction at one penny per volume, provided public lectures, wireless listening groups and guidance in reading in an attempt to change leisure patterns (Smith, 1935a, p. 119).

Public policy and leisure

The National Conference on the Leisure of the People (1919, p. 27) called for state provision for the right use of leisure as an instrument for civic happiness and this demand recurred throughout the period. Various voices called for a Ministry of Leisure (*Times*, 1933), a Leisure Party (Harris, 1927) and a 'Right to Leisure' Bill to limit the working week to 40 hours and an 8 hour day (*Times*, 1919c). Demand for greater public sector provision was also motivated by the fact that social service was unable and in some cases unwilling to meet the volume of need (Finlayson, 1990). However, little policy related to leisure in a direct manner, the two principal leisure Acts being the Holidays with Pay Act of 1938 and the Physical Training and Education Act of 1937, though as Oliver Stanley the Minister for Education noted, the latter was not primarily intended to produce elite athletes but to enable people to become better citizens through their leisure (*Times*, 1937b). The incorporation of the BBC in 1927 was also of significant relevance to leisure in its broadcasting of light entertainment, drama and music. A larger body of legislation related to leisure indirectly, extending provision through social policy and the allocation of support to the social services; this included the 1918 Education Act which promoted the co-ordination of activities for the unemployed and the provision of holiday camps and playing fields (NCSS, 1920) and the 1921 Education Act which enabled the provision of centres for physical and social training for young persons attending specified educational institutions (NCSS, 1937, p. 14). For some critics, however, policy on leisure could only be successful if it addressed a wider social agenda. Burns (1932, pp. 192–194; 1934, p. 127) for example believed leisure policy should first address long working hours, provide more education for leisure and display a holistic focus on the creation of a healthy community. Jameson (1935, pp. 12–14) took this idea further; looking to a future 'Age of Leisure' she depicted what was in essence a leisure society in which qual-

ity of life would be more politically important than economic growth. This was to be achieved through the principles of social credit in which the profit of industrial machinery would be realised in more time for leisure for everyone rather than the maximisation of economic gain for the few.

As with the state, critical opinion called for greater intervention in leisure in local authorities; it was suggested, for example, that municipal directorates of leisure activity would enable a more effective combination of public and voluntary services (Boyd & Ogilvie, 1936, p. 166). While most local authorities provided libraries, museums and parks, interest in a wider range of leisure provision was voiced; the National Conference on the Leisure of the People (1919) for example advocated the municipal provision of social centres for leisure, citing the experimental Municipal Cafes and Recreational Centres established at Carlisle and Annan as examples of what could be achieved. Local authorities also worked indirectly in leisure and since 1916 had been permitted to establish a Juvenile Organisation Committee to distribute funding to agencies providing constructive leisure occupation and to coordinate combined activities that individual clubs could not provide by themselves (*Times*, 1934b). Indeed, it was suggested that voluntary organisations should be incorporated in local authority leisure planning as was the case with other social services (Durant, 1938, pp. 252–253).

An innovative project undertaken by Wigan Borough Council in the high unemployment period of the mid-1930s sought to establish an Institute of Leisure to engage young adults who had left school but were not enrolled in the council's Evening Institutes. The disengagement of young unemployed people from public services established to provide juvenile training had been recorded by the *Times* (1934c) as of national concern and the proposed institute attracted widespread notice, described by the *Times* (1935) as a new departure in educational development. Supported by both the Ministry of Labour and the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, the Institute was proposed by the Borough Director of Education following the publication of his book *The Employment of Leisure* (Missen, 1935) which offered guidance to young people in their choice of leisure pursuits. Following changes in funding and demand, the Council abandoned the project, though it remained an example of the type of permanent facility that commentators believed should be provided through local authorities. While the inter-war period saw few major policy developments in leisure, the campaign for state provision later influenced post-war policy development, notably through the establishment of the Arts Council in 1946 and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949.

The study of leisure

The surveying and theorising of leisure in inter-war Britain was distributed across the social services, universities, journalism and religion, the consolidation of a coherent whole being hampered by lack of centralisation and disparity in context and methodological approach (May & Petgen, 1928, p. 148). Nevertheless, there emerged a body of work, based predominantly within the social sciences, which explored the potential functions of leisure in the construction and maintenance of social and civic life. In North America too leisure became understood as a social product and its study to be essentially sociological (Lundberg et al., 1934; Neumeyer & Neumeyer, 1936). In addition to its sociological and cultural aspects, leisure

had psychological significance; the National Institute of Industrial Psychology (1939), for example, undertook an investigation of the influence of cost, accessibility and 'social atmosphere' on leisure choices and of the relationship between the physical and nervous strains of work and the enjoyment of leisure time. Although leisure was too complex a field of study to reside in any existing academic discipline, its dominant discourse remained grounded in its social context.

The coming of leisure led to calls for wider academic recognition. Noting the existence of a National Recreation School in New York, Jacks (1932) proposed the establishment of a National College of Recreational Culture in the UK to enable the study of recreation and its values in order to form 'future recreational leaders', while Lundberg et al. (1934, p. 11) urged a more serious academic consideration of leisure in the social sciences. Neumeyer and Neumeyer (1936) meanwhile produced what was essentially a leisure studies text book to help the reader understand leisure in modern society, each chapter concluding with questions and discussion points. The outbreak of war interrupted progress and no further major studies of leisure were undertaken in Britain until the publication in 1951 of Rowntree and Lavers' *English Life and Leisure*. When leisure began to receive serious sociological attention in the 1970s, the inter-war debates on work–leisure relationships, inequality in leisure, young peoples' leisure, the potential of leisure to develop citizenship and communities, the effects of new mass forms of leisure, passivity, individual agency, the right use of leisure and the respective roles of the state and the voluntary sector in providing leisure opportunities were re-interpreted as core themes of the emerging field of Leisure Studies, though with minimal acknowledgement of the extensive body of related work produced between the wars. The inter-war theorisation of leisure in Britain nevertheless produced a legacy of principles which anticipated those adopted within Leisure Studies in Britain, notably the belief that equality and democratic opportunity in leisure were of fundamental importance and that the State had duty to provide leisure facilities and opportunities, on a democratic basis, to promote individual and social well-being.

Conclusion

In the inter-war decades leisure became recognised and debated as an important facet of individual and social life. Leisure – encompassing spare time pursuits as varied as gambling, sexual promiscuity, drinking and the mass passive entertainment of the cinema as well as hiking, gardening, amateur dramatics and solving crosswords – was not synonymous with recreation, though it embraced it. The more fluid and less utilitarian overtones of leisure were better suited to the changed social and cultural world of 1919 than the utilitarian and moralistic associations of recreation. It was noted above that some contemporary theorists interpreted the new leisure as being categorically different from the Victorian concept of recreation. However, a more telling comparison was that with the society of 1913 for as the introduction to the New London Survey (Smith, 1935b, p. 5) warned, the reader would be repeatedly confronted with the fact that the most fruitful comparison was not so much between the present and 40 years ago as between post- and pre-war conditions.

If the new leisure was a product of the post-First World War world then it was essentially also one of late modernity. The new world view of the inter-war period was formed by fundamental and in many cases sudden shifts from the Edwardian years which included elements of late modernity such as mass communications,

new technologies, disintegration, reformation and rapid change (Childs, 2000; Kim, 2003) and it is worth recalling the extent to which, as shown above, the 'new' leisure was seen after the war to have come suddenly. The lived modernity of the inter-war decades featured increased democracy, a concomitant growth of interest in education in citizenship and the emergence of a mass consumer market. While an ever-advancing modernity was feared and resisted, there were those who, as Darling (2007, p. 13) contends, 'saw in these unsettling shifts the beginnings of a better Britain'. Leisure, being a sphere in which several of these shifts coincided was in part feared, but it simultaneously presented opportunities through which a new and better society might be created.

Note

1. Cecil Delisle Burns, who is quoted extensively in this article, was one of the most prolific leisure theorists of the inter-war period and published a substantial volume of work on leisure, democracy and society in addition to presenting a series of wireless broadcasts on modern leisure. Having worked in the Ministry of Reconstruction and the Joint Research Department of the Trades Union Congress and Labour Party, he became a lecturer in logic and philosophy at Birkbeck College in 1924 and moved to the London School of Economics and Political Science as lecturer in social philosophy. In 1927 he was appointed to the newly established Stevenson Lectureship in Citizenship at Glasgow University which, as the *Times* (1942) commented, allowed him to devote more time to writing. Burns promoted a democratic society in which a lived ideal of freedom in leisure combined with its sensitive and humane enjoyment would lead to shared enjoyment, greater fellowship and enhanced citizenship.

Notes on contributors

Robert Snape is Head of the Centre for Worktown Studies at the University of Bolton. His research interests focus on the social and cultural history of leisure in Britain 1850–1939 and his work has been published in *Leisure Studies*, the *Journal of Victorian Culture, Museum and Society* and the *Journal of Tourism History*.

Helen Pussard is an independent scholar with a research focus on leisure in twentieth century Britain. Her publications include *Defining the Field: 30 Years of the Leisure Studies Association* (co-edited with Eileen Kennedy) and co-editor with Robert Snape of *Recording Leisure Lives: Histories, Archives and Memories of Leisure in Twentieth Century Britain* and *Recording Leisure Lives: Sports, Games and Pastimes in Twentieth Century Britain* (all published by the Leisure Studies Association).

References

Ammon, C.G. (1919). *Municipal cafes, libraries and Winter Gardens* (pp. 14–19). National Conference on the Leisure of the People, Manchester.

Arnold, M. (1960). *Culture and anarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Attlee, C.R. (1920). *The social worker*. London: Bell.

Badley. (1917). The right use of leisure. In A.C. Benson (Ed.), *Cambridge essays on education* (pp. 168–187). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barker, E. (1928, January 10). Political ideas: Our debt to ancient Greece. *Times*, p. 16, col. E.

Barker, E. (1933). *The uses of leisure*. London: The World Association for Adult Education.

Boyd, W., & Ogilvie, V. (1936). *The challenge of leisure*. London: New Education Fellowship.

Brasnett, M. (1969). *Voluntary social action: A history of the National Council of Social Service 1919–1969*. London: National Council of Social Service.

Burns, C.D. (1925). *Industry and civilization*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Burns, C.D. (1929). *Democracy: Its defects and advantages*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Burns, C.D. (1931). *Modern civilization on trial*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Burns, C.D. (1932). *Leisure in the modern world*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Burns, C.D. (1934). *The challenge to democracy*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Carlyle, T. (1870). Signs of the Times. In T. Carlyle (Ed.), *Critical and miscellaneous essays volume two* (pp. 98–118). London: Chapman and Hall.
Castle, E.B., Ottaway, A.K.C., & Rawson, W.T.R. (1935). *The coming of leisure. The problem in England*. London: New Education Fellowship.
Childs, P. (2000). *Modernism*. London: Routledge.
Conference on Christian Politics, Economics, Citizenship. (1924). *Report on leisure*. London: Longman Green.
Cunningham, V. (1988). *British writers of the thirties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cutten, G.B. (1926). *The threat of leisure*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Dark, S. (1929). *After working hours. The enjoyment of leisure*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Darling, E. (2007). *Re-forming Britain: Narratives of modernity before reconstruction*. Abingdon: Routledge.
de Grazia, S. (1962). *Of time, work and leisure*. New York, NY: Twentieth Century Fund.
Dumazedier, J. (1967). *Toward a society of leisure*. London: Collier Macmillan.
Durant, H. (1938). *The problem of leisure*. London: Routledge.
Ellis, H. (1936). *Questions of our day*. London: Bodley Head.
Finlayson, G. (1990). A moving frontier: Voluntarism and the state in British Social Welfare 1911–1949. *Twentieth Century British History, 1*(2), 183–206.
Gardiner, R. (1936). *The muses and the people in England*. Report on the World Congress on Leisure Time and Recreation, Hamburg.
Green, M. (1976). *Children of the sun. A narrative of decadence in England after 1918*. London: Pimlico.
Hall, S., & Whannel, P. (1964). *The popular arts*. London: Hutchinson.
Hammond, J.L. (1933). *The growth of common enjoyment*. London: Oxford University Press.
Harris, C. (1927). *The use of leisure in Bethnal Green: A survey of social conditions in the borough 1925 to 1926*. London: The Lindsey Press.
Harris, B. (2004). *The origins of the British welfare state: Society, state and social welfare in England and Wales 1800–1945*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Haworth, J., Parker, S., & Roberts, J. (1982). Editorial. *Leisure Studies*, *1*(1), iii–iv.
Henriques, J.Q. (1938). *A citizen's guide to social service*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Hill, J. (2002). *Sport, leisure and culture in twentieth-century Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Hoggart, R. (1958). *The uses of literacy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Hopkins, E. (2000). *Industrialisation and society: A social history 1830–1951*. London: Routledge.
Hubble, N. (2010). *Mass observation and everyday life: Culture, history, theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Hyde, R.H. (1921). *The boy in industry and leisure*. London: Bell.
International Labour Office. (1924.). *Report on the development of facilities for the utilisation of the workers' leisure*, Geneva.
International Labour Office. (1939). *Facilities for the use of workers' leisure during holidays*. Studies and Papers Series G (Housing and Welfare) No. 5, Geneva.
Jacks, L.P. (1931). *The education of the whole man: A plea for a new spirit in education*. London: London University Press.
Jacks, L.P. (1932). *Education through recreation*. London: University of London Press.
Jameson, S. (1935). *The soul of man in an age of leisure*. London: Pamphlets on the New Economic Society No. 13.
Joad, C.E.M. (1929). *Diogenes, or the future of leisure*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trubner.
Jones, D.C. (1934). *The social survey of Merseyside*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Jones, S.G. (1986). *Workers at play: A social and economic history of leisure, 1918–1939*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kaplan, M. (1960). *Leisure in America*. New York, NY: Wiley.
Kim, K. (2003). *Order and agency in modernity: Talcott Parsons, Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
Kinna, R. (2000). William Morris: Art, work and leisure. *Journal of the History of Ideas, 61* (3), 493–512.
Leavis, F.R. (1930). *Mass civilization and minority culture*. Cambridge: Minority Press.
Leavis, Q.D. (1932). *Fiction and the reading public*. London: Chatto and Windus.
Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid. (1916). *Liverpool social workers' handbook* (2nd ed.). Liverpool.
Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid. (1923). *Report on the uses of leisure in Liverpool*. Liverpool.
Lundberg, G.A., Komarovsky, M., & McInerny, M.A. (1934). *Leisure: A suburban study*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
Lynd, R.S., & Lynd, H.M. (1929). *Middletown: A study in American culture*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
Mass Observation. (1987). *The pub and the people: A worktown study by mass observation*. London: The Cresset Library.
May, H., & Petgen, D. (1928). *Leisure and its use: Some international observations*. New York, NY: Barnes.
McCarthy, H. (2007). Parties, voluntary associations, and democratic politics in interwar Britain. *Historical Journal, 50*(4), 891–912.
McKibbin, R. (2000). *Classes and cultures: England 1918–1951*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Mess, H.A. (1928). *Industrial Tyneside: A social survey*. London: Benn.
Missen, L.R. (1935). *The employment of leisure*. Exeter: Wheaton.
Mommaas, H. (1996). *Leisure research in Europe: Methods and traditions*. Wallingford, CT: CAB International.
Mommaas, H. (1997). European leisure studies at the crossroads? A history of leisure research in Europe. *Leisure Sciences, 19*, 241–254.
Montgomery, J. (1957). *The twenties: An informal social history*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Morgan, K. (2001). The twentieth century. In K. Morgan (Ed.), *The Oxford history of Britain* (pp. 582–679). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Mowat, C.L. (1955). *Britain between the wars 1918–1940*. London: Methuen.
National Conference on the Leisure of the People. (1919). *The leisure of the people: A handbook*. Manchester.
National Council of Social Service. (1920). *Reconstruction and social service: Report of a conference called by the National Council of Social Service*. London: P.S. King.
National Council of Social Service. (1937). *New housing estates and their social problems* (4th ed.). National Council of Social Service.
National Institute of Industrial Psychology. (1939). *Leisure pursuits outside the family circle*. London: National Institute of Industrial Psychology.
Neumeyer, M., & Neumeyer, E. (1936). *Leisure and recreation: A study of leisure and recreation in their sociological aspects*. New York, NY: Barnes.
Nicholas, S. (1998). From John Bull to John Citizen: Images of national identity and citizenship on the wartime BBC. In R. Weight & A. Beach (Eds.), *The right to belong: Citizenship and national identity in Britain 1930–1960* (pp. 35–38). London: I.B. Tauris.
Orage, A.R. (1935). *The fear of leisure*. London: Stanley Nott [Pamphlets on the New Economics No. 5].
Orwell, G. (1962). *The road to Wigan Pier*. London: Penguin (Original work published 1937).
Overy, R. (2010). *The morbid age: Britain and the crisis of civilization, 1919–1939*. London: Penguin.
Pack, A.N. (1934). *The challenge of leisure*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
Perkin, H. (1989). *The rise of professional society: England since 1880*. London: Routledge.
Pruette, L. (1924). *Women and leisure: A study of social waste*. New York, NY: E.P. Dutton.
Roberston, C. Grant (1925). Libraries and citizenship. *Library Association Record, 3 (New Series)*, 217–229.

Roberts, K. (1970). *Leisure*. London: Longman.
Rooff, M. (1935). *Youth and leisure. A survey of girls' organisations in England and Wales*. Edinburgh: CUKT and National Council of Girls' Clubs.
Rowntree, B. Seebohm (1930, March 11). Letter. *Times*, p. 17, col. F.
Rowntree, B. Seebohm (1941). *'Poverty and progress': A second social survey of York*. London: Longman Green.
Rowntree, B. Seebohm, & Lavers, G.R. (1951). *English life and leisure*. London: Longmans, Green.
Sayers, D. (1933). *Murder must advertise*. London: Gollancz.
Sizer, J.P. (1917). *The commercialisation of leisure*. Boston, MA: R.G. Badger.
Smith, H.L. (Ed.). (1935a). New survey of London life and labour. Vol. IX *Life and leisure*. London: London School of Economics.
Smith, H.L. (Ed.) (1935b). New survey of London life and labour. Vol. I *Forty years of change*. London: London School of Economics.
Sociological Review. (1918). The principles of state-action in reconstruction. *10*(1), 44–53.
Stebbins, R. (1992). *Amateurs, professionals, and serious leisure*. London: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Stebbins, R. (2007). *Serious leisure: A perspective for our time*. London: Transaction.
Thorpe, A. (1994). *Britain in the ear of the two world wars 1914–45*. London: Longman.
Times. (1919a, February 11). The workers' demands. p. 12, col. F.
Times. (1919b, March 27). Boys and girls from munitions. A visit to Woolwich Centre: Training of future citizens. p. 9, col. A.
Times. (1919c, March 29). The leisure problem: Work among working women. p. 13, col. F.
Times. (1921, September 6). The woman's view: A girl and her leisure. p. 11, col. D.
Times. (1930, March 31). Working girls and domestic service. p. 11, col. D.
Times. (1933, April 6). Age of leisure. p. 9, col. D.
Times. (1934a, February 8). Welfare of unemployed women. p. 15, col. C.
Times. (1934b, May 4). Young workers. Use of leisure hours in London. p. 11, col. A.
Times. (1934c, October 27). The young worker's leisure. p. 13, col. C.
Times. (1935, October 17). Institute of leisure. Carnegie grant for Wigan experiment. p. 12, col. D.
Times. (1937a, September 29). Setting an example. p. 13, col. C.
Times. (1937b, January 9). Government's Physical Training Scheme. p. 14, col. E.
Times. (1938, August 10). Centres of social life. p. 13, col. E.
Times. (1942, January 23). Dr C. Delisle Burns. Labour thinker and lecturer. p. 7, col. E.
Tinkler, P. (2003). Cause for concern: Young women and leisure, 1930–50. *Women's History Review, 12*(2), 233–260.
Wells, A.F. (1936). Social surveys and sociology. *Sociological Review, 28*, 274–294.
Wilkinson, E. (1939). *The town that was murdered: The life-story of Jarrow*. London: Gollancz.
Zweiniger-Bargielowska, I. (2011). The making of a modern female body: Beauty, health and fitness in interwar Britain. *Women's History Review, 20*(2), 299–317.